



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A SKETCH OF SOCIALISTIC THOUGHT IN ENGLAND.

FOR STUDENTS OF SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY.*

"It is sheer intellectual laziness," Sidney Webb says, "not to know what socialism is" in these days of almost superabundant literature on the subject. Professor Flint says that socialism cannot be defined. One difference between these authorities is, that while the former is engaged in introducing "increments" of socialism, the latter has departed from his proper field of philosophy to write a large book on a subject he has not taken the trouble to investigate. We shall avoid the necessity of deciding this difference of opinion by defining the socialism of this article (in the dynamic sense) as the movement toward the collective ownership and administration of land and capital. Our study will be confined to the development of the collectivist ideal in England. Every reform which would aid collectivism will be considered socialistic.

Socialism in this sense was made possible, perhaps inevitable, by the factory system. With the introduction of the joint-stock principle in capital, it was merely a question of the solidarity of political organization when the community should undertake such enterprises as it could better conduct than private companies. Before the advantages of the joint-stock company were fully appreciated, the proposals for industrial reform were almost entirely communistic. The continuance of the communist ideal is doubtless due largely to the maladministration of private corporations, and partly to the survival of domestic methods of production, and a distrust in the superiority of the factory over

* This may be called a syllabus. The bibliographies are not intended to be exhaustive. Unusual events and only the most important contributors to the progress of thought toward collectivism have been selected. It is impossible to make a thorough study of the subject without continual reference to material only to be had in London.

the domestic system. It will, however, be admitted that the collectivist ideal has largely supplanted the communist. This is not only due to the enormous development of capitalistic enterprise, but to the education of large and influential elements of the people in such collective institutions as trade unions, coöperative societies, friendly societies, and the civil service.

It is manifest that the ideal of the collective control of capital could not have preceded the industrial revolution and the factory system. The marvel would be that the ideal could even subsequently become effective if we consider only the unparalleled expansion of industry and commerce as a result of capitalistic enterprise. The effectiveness of the ideal is undoubtedly still limited by the success of capitalism, but it is strengthened by the inadequacy of capitalism to meet social needs, and the growth of a new machinery of government capable apparently of ministering in some measure to those needs. The first man to successfully criticise the capitalist system was Robert Owen. The strengthening of the governmental machine dates from the political philosophy of Jeremy Bentham. If we begin our studies then with these men, we shall find it convenient to divide the history of the century into periods which will show, first, the men and ideals which were chiefly influential; second, the intervening events which strengthened the growing ideals or gave rise to new ones. We shall find periods of sixteen years, beginning with 1832, to give us convenient and usually homogeneous divisions.

Previous to 1832 the chief constructive ideals were the reforms of law and government proposed by Bentham, and the reforms of the factory system suggested and in some cases experimentally introduced by Owen.¹

Ia. In 1832, the year of Bentham's death, the first great act for the reform of parliament was passed, and one of the early

¹ *References.*—BENTHAM, *A Fragment on Government*. Edited by Montague, Oxford, 1891. *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, Oxford, 1876. *Works*, 11 vols., Edinburgh, 1843. LLOYD JONES, *Life of Robert Owen*, Soc. Sci. Ser. OWEN, *Addresses*, London, 1835; *Observations on the Effect of the Manufacturing System*, London, 1875.

measures brought in by the Reform Parliament was the Municipal Reform Act (1835) the first great step in local government.

Ib. 1832-1848.—This period includes the continued activities of Owen, who was now largely dissipating his energies in community schemes, though he also happily demonstrated in the *Labor Exchange* the futility of the doctrine that labor is the sole source of value, taught by Francis Place,¹ William Thomson, Owen, and later by Marx. The chief new actors are Coleridge, Shaftesbury, and Cobden.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge was the prime inspiration of the early Christian socialist movement. He provided Maurice with some of his chief social doctrines. He accepted the organic conception of society. He criticised the aggressions of capital. He denounced the accepted political economy, especially Malthusianism. He placed citizenship before Christianity. Two quotations will suggest the advisability of consulting his writings in a study of the crude socialism of the broad churchmen. In a conversation with Harriet Martineau "he avowed that there were points on which we differed (I was full of wonder that there were any on which we agreed). For instance, said he, you appear to consider that society is an aggregate of individuals. I replied that I certainly did, whereupon he went off on one of the several metaphysical interpretations which may be put upon the many-sided fact of an organized human society, subject to natural laws in virtue of its aggregate character and organization together."² In his Second Lay Sermon, p. 414, he gives as the positive ends of the state: (1) "To make the means of subsistence more easy to each individual. (2) To secure to each of its members the hope of bettering his own condition or that of his children. (3) The development of those faculties which are essential to his humanity, that is, to his rational and moral being." The state which Coleridge has in mind is an aristocratic one, and his social philosophy is consequently paternalistic, but

¹ WALLAS, G. *Francis Place*, Longmans' (in press).

² HARRIET MARTINEAU, *Autobiography*, I, 397-8. Compare COLERIDGE, *The Friend*, 161.

we find it to be the basis of what Maurice and Kingsley called Christian socialism.¹

Lord Ashley, afterwards the Earl of Shaftesbury, from his first entrance into parliament devoted himself to the suffering people. He succeeded in stopping many of the abuses in lunatic asylums, which were formerly exclusively private institutions. He gave himself to the chimney sweeps, to ragged schools, to the victims from the opium trade in China, but his life work was the improvement of the factory operatives' life. He came into prominence in connection with the Ten Hours' Bill, which was being advocated as a result of the report of the commissioners of 1833. From that time to 1850, when the Ten Hours' Bill became law, Lord Ashley gave up every opportunity for preferment and personal enjoyment in his untiring devotion to the extension of the protective functions of the state. One need not ignore the services of Owen, Oastler, Hobhouse, Sadler and others in crediting the lion's share in the early development of factory legislation to the Earl of Shaftesbury. The importance of this act of 1850 was the establishment of the right and wisdom of the government in interfering with the manufacturers in the interest of their operatives. Although the act, as worded, provided only for a ten hours' day for women and young persons, it was clearly understood throughout the debate, as is indicated by the speeches of the opposition, that this restriction would also necessitate the limitation of the hours of adult males, and the battle was fought on that ground. Ten years later an almost unanimous expression of parliament endorsed the action. By this act one of the most favorable steps to socialism was taken. Henceforth the question of state interference is one of expediency, not of principle.²

¹ *References*.—COLERIDGE, *Complete Works*, 7 vols., New York, 1884; *The Table Talk*, Bohn's Library, 1884; *The Friend*, Bohn's Library, 1866; *Letters, Conversations, etc.*, London, 1864. CAINE, HALL, *Life of Coleridge* (excellent bibliography), 1887. TRAILL, H. D., *Life of Coleridge*, 1884.

² *References*.—PLENER, *English Factory Legislation*, London, 1873. SEELEY, *Memoirs of M. T. Sadler*, London, 1842. HODDER, *Life of Lord Shaftesbury*, London, 1892. JEVONS, *The State in Relation to Labor*, London, 1889.

Among the many instructive features of this period might be mentioned the Chartist agitation and the radical social philosophy of the Chartists (yet their teachings bore greatest fruit when they were dead).

Communitic coöperation collapsed in 1834. Democratic coöperation was born in Rochdale in 1844, Charles Haworth's device of dividend on purchase being the most socialistic principle yet introduced into private enterprise. But this movement has greatest interest for us in its relation to capitalistic organization during a subsequent period.

The anti-corn-law agitation of Cobden, Bright, and others, culminated in the repeal of the corn laws. Richard Cobden was as far from being tainted with the germs of socialism as Jeremy Bentham, and his name has been mentioned chiefly because he was the principal representative of the individualist school at this period. Yet the repeal of the corn laws and the agitation for free trade paved the way not only for an enormous development of industry, but for other demands for freedom in industry not anticipated by the individualists, and which they could not stifle.¹

IIa. In 1846 the corn laws were repealed; 1848, the Chartist agitation collapses; 1850, the Ten Hours' Bill was passed.

IIb. 1848-1864.—The philosophy of Coleridge lives over into this period in the teachings of Maurice. The other chief personalities are Carlyle, Comte, and J. S. Mill.

Frederick Denison Maurice and his followers, Kingsley, Hughes, Ludlow, and all the noble band of Christian socialists, derived their philosophy from Coleridge, Carlyle, the French communists, and the revelations of Chartism. Their sociology, was crude, their ideal of little coöperative workshops was crude, but their sympathies and devotion were great and formed the needful complement to the denunciations of Carlyle. Two brief

¹ *References*.—MORLEY, *Life of Cobden*, 2 vols., 1896. TRUMBULL, *The Free Trade Movement in England*, Open Court Co. HOLYOAKE, *The Rochdale Pioneers*, London, 1893. MARTINEAU, *History of the Peace*, Bohn's Library, 4 vols. HELD, *Zwei Bücher zur sozialen Geschichte Englands*, Leipzig, 1881. SCHULZE-GAEVERNITZ, *Zum sozialen Frieden*, Vol. I, 309-343, Leipzig, 1890.

quotations from Maurice will serve to illustrate the teachings of this group of men. "Monarchy with me is the starting point. I look upon socialism as historically developed out of it, not absorbing it into itself. A king given and an aristocracy given and I can see my way clearly to call upon them to do the work which God has laid upon them; to repent of their sins, to labor that the whole manhood of the country may have a voice, that every member of Christ's body may be indeed a free man."

"Competition is put forth as the law of the universe. That is a lie. The time is come for us to declare that it is a lie, by word and deed. I see no way but associating for work instead of for strikes." Christian socialism has never died. Today the influence of Maurice is only one among many others sustaining it, and that influence is largely an emotional one, yet so long as inspiration is needed for social regeneration, whether in the state or the individual, it is hard to overestimate teachings like his.¹

The place of honor in this period undoubtedly belongs to Thomas Carlyle. While his teachings have had to be made positive, expanded, almost transformed by his followers, before they could contribute to the collectivist ideal, they undoubtedly aided indirectly every progressive social movement by weakening the faith in the existing order. If Carlyle was not a socialist he was the most powerful anti-individualist of the century. He shares with Coleridge and Comte the credit of having introduced a crude conception of the organic nature of society, being influenced as was the former by German philosophy, but he stands alone in the vigor of his destructive criticisms. Carlyle's writings must be read not merely as literature, but as prophecy. One example will suffice. Its counterparts are legion:

¹ References.—*Life and Letters of F. D. Maurice*, by J. F. MAURICE, 2 vols., London, 1884. *Life and Letters of Kingsley*, by his wife. MAURICE, *On the Reformation of Society*, Southampton, 1851; *Social Morality*, London, 1869; *The Workman and the Franchise*, New York, 1866; *Christian Socialism*, Church Social Union, Boston, 1896; *Tracts on Christian Socialism*, London, 1850; *The Christian Socialist*, 2 vols., London, 1851. SCHULZE-GAEVERNITZ, *Zum sozialen Frieden*, I, 295-306. KAUFMANN, M., *Christian Socialism*, London, 1888.

I admire a nation which fancies it will die if we do not undersell all other nations to the end of the world. Brother, we will cease to undersell them; we will be content to equalsell them; to be happy selling equally with them! I do not see the use of underselling them. Cotton cloth is already twopence a yard or lower, and yet bared backs were never more numerous among us. Let inventive men cease to spend their existence incessantly contriving how cotton can be made cheaper; and try to invent a little how cotton at its present cheapness could be somewhat justlier divided among us. Let inventive men consider whether the secret of this universe, and of man's life here, does after all, as we rashly fancy it, consist in making money! There is one God, just, supreme, almighty; but is mammon the name of him? With a hell which means "Failing to make money," I do not think there is any heaven possible that would suit one well; nor so much as an earth that can be habitable long. In brief, all this mammon gospel of supply and demand, competition, *laissez faire*, and devil take the hindmost, begins to be one of the shabbiest gospels ever preached, or altogether the shabbiest.¹

Auguste Comte's influence promised at one time to become the dominant one in English social philosophy. Harriet Martineau made such an excellent two-volume abridgment of his ponderous work that he had it retranslated into French. Lewes and George Eliot preached positivism incessantly to their large coterie of influential friends, including the young Frederick Harrison destined to be the greatest champion of positivism in England. Herbert Spencer, whatever be his own opinion in the matter, is generally conceded to have helped to spread the positive philosophy. The most successful workers in the field of social reform in the seventies were the positivists. Today the two little rival religious bodies which continue to hold their

¹ *References.*—The best estimates of Carlyle's teachings and influence are to be found in SCHULZE-GÆVERNITZ, *Zum sozialen Frieden*, I, 77–290, Leipzig, 1890, printed separately as "Thomas Carlyle;" and CLARKE, "Carlyle and Ruskin and their Influence on English Thought," *New England Magazine*, December 1893. CARLYLE, *Sartor Resartus, Past and Present, Chartism, Latter Day Pamphlets, Correspondence between Goethe and Carlyle*, 1887, *Correspondence of Carlyle and Emerson*, Boston, 1886; *Early Letters*, London, 1886; *Letters*, London, 1888. FROUDE, J. A., *Thomas Carlyle's First Forty Years*, 2 vols., London, 1890; *Thomas Carlyle in London*, 2 vols., 1890. JENKS, *Thomas Carlyle and J. S. Mill*, London, 1888. NICHOL, *Thomas Carlyle (English Men of Letters)*. TAINE, *English Literature*, Vol. II. FLÜGEL, *Carlyle's religiöse und sittliche Entwicklung*, Leipzig, 1887. WHITMAN, W., *Prose Works*, 168–78, Philadelphia, 1892.

peculiar Sunday services seem to be almost all that remain. It would be a great mistake to estimate the influence of Comte in contemporary England by these little circles of religiosity. His elevation of the idea of humanity, his philosophy of order and progress, his inspiration of some of the noblest workers and sociological thinkers of the last half century have been incalculable boons to social progress. Socialism has been helped by positivists partly by their tolerance, partly by their conceding it to be one of the preliminary stages in the progress toward positivism, partly by the exaggerated emphasis of the social organism.

Comte must be allowed to speak just a few words for himself. "The ideas of order and progress are, in social physics, as rigorously inseparable as the ideas of organization and life in biology, The misfortune of our actual state is that the two ideas are set up in radical opposition to each other—the retrograde spirit having directed all efforts in favor of order, and an anarchical doctrine having arrogated to itself the charge of social progress." The truth of this doctrine is illustrated by the fact that the positivists have lost ground ever since the collectivist movement came forward with the assurance of a reconciliation of order and progress.¹

John Stuart Mill contributed to the progressive movement, despite his individualism, by developing the doctrine of utilitarianism, by writing a transitional political economy (between Manchesterism on one side and the historical school on the other), by laying down principles of liberty which his own philosophy could not realize, by championing the cause of woman, by his political position as an advanced radical belonging to the group which has evolved into semi-collectivists today. His

¹ References.—COMTE, *General View of Positivism*, 2d ed., London, 1880. MARTINEAU, H., *The Positive Philosophy of A. Comte*, 3 vols., London, 1896. MILL, J. S., *Auguste Comte*, London, 1877. COMTE, *Lettres à des positivistes anglais*, London, 1889. CAIRD, *Social Philosophy and Religion of Comte*, 1885. WATSON, *Comte, Mill and Spencer*, 1895. SOMMER, H., *Die positive Philosophie A. Comtes*, Berlin, 1866. FOUILLÉE, A., *Le mouvement positiviste et la conception sociologique du monde*, Paris, 1896. SCHULZE-GAEVERNITZ, *Zum sozialen Frieden*, II, 3-77, Leipzig, 1890.

influence was also valuable because in contrast with Herbert Spencer his individualism weakened with maturity.¹

IIIa. The beginning of the sixties was marked by the revelations of Darwin, Wallace, and Spencer in the field of biology, later to enormously influence sociological thought.

In 1864 the great coöperative movement began to attract attention and illustrate the progress of democracy by the organization of the Wholesale Society, coördinating and consolidating the distributive societies all over England. In 1867 another great step in parliamentary reform strengthened the power of the growing spirit of democracy.

IIIb. 1864-1880.—The giants in this period are T. H. Green, Ruskin, and Spencer. The greatest philosophic mind of the century was doubtless that of Thomas Hill Green. He deepened ethical and political philosophy while he at the same time made their application practicable by bringing them into conformity with the laws of evolution. A mere hint at a few of the subjects he has treated with the unrivaled skill not merely of the greatest English philosopher of the nineteenth century, but of an experienced politician, will suffice to show the necessity of examining his influence on contemporary political philosophy; thus: the relation of the individual to the state, the liberty of the individual, natural rights, the spontaneity of social interests, freedom of contract, rationale of property, land monopoly.

Green's advance on Mill's doctrine of liberty may illustrate the position of progressive thought in this period as compared with the former one.

The freedom to do as they like on the part of one set of men may involve the ultimate disqualification of many others, or of a succeeding generation, for the exercise of rights. This applies most obviously to such kinds of contract or traffic as affect the health and housing of the people, the growth of population relatively to the means of subsistence, and the accumulation or distribution of landed property. In the hurry of removing those restraints on

¹ References.—MILL, *Dissertations and Discussions*, 4 vols., London, 1859-75; *Political Economy*, successive editions. *Autobiography*, London, 1873. *Socialism* New York, 1891. COURTNEY, W. L., *Life of J. S. Mill*, 1886. WATSON, *Comte, Mill and Spencer*.

free dealing between man and man which have arisen partly, perhaps, from some confused idea of maintaining morality, but much more from the power of class interests, we have been apt to take too narrow a view of the range of persons—not one generation merely, but succeeding generations—whose freedom ought to be taken into account (freedom here meaning their qualifications for the exercise of rights). Hence the massing of population without regard to conditions of health; unrestrained traffic in deleterious commodities; unlimited upgrowth of the class of hired laborers in particular industries, which circumstances have suddenly stimulated, without any provision against the danger of an impoverished proletariat in following generations.¹

John Ruskin is so well known that he is but little studied. Otherwise more people would know that he has been one of the greatest ethical and economic teachers of this century. Of deep significance are his contributions to social welfare in the realm of art, still scantily appreciated even by his admirers, and his sturdy and beautiful ethics. For a true appreciation of Ruskin one must carefully follow the processes of thought which led the art critic to turn economist. Disregarding his disputed economic contributions he has, by promulgating the first scientific conception of wealth, given promise of revolutionizing economic thought. No single influence has been so great on the young British economist of today, and even the popular mind has been aided by it in ways that it will take a generation fully to appreciate.

Ruskin was also the first to lay stress on the importance of consumption.

The greatest problem of political economy is the consumption of goods. The great question for a people is not how much labor can be employed, but how much life is made possible. It is uneconomic to produce anything which does not lead to life. There is no wealth but life—life, including all its powers of love, of joy, of admiration. That country is richest which nourishes the greatest number of noble and happy human beings, and that man is richest who, having perfected the functions of his own life to the utmost, has also the widest helpful influence, both personally and by means of his possessions, over the lives of others.

¹ *References*.—GREEN, *Works*, 3 vols., with Memoir, London, 1885. *Lectures on Political Obligation*, London, 1895. FAIRBROTHER, *The Philosophy of Thomas Hill Green*, London, 1896.

The impartial student will be chiefly impressed by the effect of these doctrines in transferring, unconsciously to Ruskin himself, the chief defenses of collectivist and other progressive social movements from the sphere of economics to that of sociology. His doctrine of wealth is as yet often neglected because its place is not found in the conflict over the limits of economics and sociology.

A remarkable feature of Ruskin's influence is its extent. The numerous Ruskin clubs comprise manufacturers, shopkeepers, professional men and women, university professors, teachers, artisans, clergymen, laborers, and other equally diverse classes.¹

Herbert Spencer has enjoyed the distinction and suffered the misfortune of completing recently a system of philosophy. It has been carried out with remarkable faithfulness to the original plan. Since the prospectus of the Synthetic Philosophy was issued, the whole tenor of philosophic thought has changed, some of the most important practical applications of the growing body of knowledge have been made, but the Synthetic Philosophy has proceeded, serenely indifferent to the progress of the world. One cannot but admire the man whose physical disabilities for thirty-six years permitted at the most not more than three hours' work a day. In the face of that fact the completion of this great system is a marvel, but one can hardly be expected to accept the later results of this plucky invalid, who for years has been out of touch with the actual affairs of life. The man who could boast in his latest volume that in the middle of this century (especially in England) a degree of individual freedom had been reached "greater than ever before existed since nations began to form" is alluding to a period, the memory of which brings the blush to the cheek of every lover of his kind.

His influence has been great, both negatively in bolstering up a party of reaction, and positively in actual contributions to

¹ References.—RUSKIN, *Unto This Last*; *Crown of Wild Olive*; *Ethics of the Dust*; *Munera Pulveris*; *Sesame and Lilies*; *Fors Clavigera*; *Præterita*. COLLINGWOOD, *Life and Works of John Ruskin*, 2 vols., London, 1893; *The Art Teaching of John Ruskin*, London, 1891; *The Ruskin Reader*, 1895. GEDDES, *John Ruskin, Economist*, Round Table Series, 1884. AXON, *John Ruskin*, a bibliographical

sociological thought. The inelasticity of the system is what has destroyed its once promising influence. The strong negative element characterized by the damaging phrase, "administrative nihilism," has also undoubtedly tended to weaken the positive element. It is difficult for the Americans, who are still reading Spencer, to realize what a negligible quantity he has become in England. Perhaps it will suffice to illustrate this estimate of Spencer by saying that the most intellectual woman among the collectivists was a personal student of Spencer for years.¹

IVa. Sydney Webb, in a lecture on "The Progress of Collectivism," delivered in February, 1894, said: "The turning point in the history of socialism in England may be taken to be 1880. Prior to that unsystematic individualism reigned supreme. The political ideal was free competition and the minimum of government, whilst the millennium for the workers was to turn artisans into little capitalists, and agricultural laborers into owners of 'three acres and a cow.' In 1879 there were more unemployed than there have ever been since; but no responsible authority thought of anything but charity or poor-law relief for them. In 1882 John Morley, in commending the systematic and constructive thought of John Stuart Mill and his school, declared that no such political thinking then existed. This introduction of constructive thought into English politics is the great work of the socialist movement Twenty years ago the typical young politician was an individualist quoting Herbert Spencer. Today he is an empirical collectivist of a practical kind."

The deductive political economy of Ricardo, Mill, and Cairnes was giving way before special economic investigations and the influence of German thinkers, which led to the growth of

biography, 1879; RUSKIN, *Abstract of the Objects and Constitution of St. George's Guild*, 1877; *The Guild of St. George*, Master's Report, 1885. CLARKE, "Carlyle and Ruskin and their Influence on English Thought," *New England Magazine*, December 1893. COOKE, *Studies in Ruskin*, London, 1896.

¹ References.—SPENCER, *Principles of Sociology*, 3 vols.; *Justice ; Social Statics ; Man vs. the State*. WATSON, *Comte, Mill, and Spencer*. BÖSCH, *Die entwicklungstheoretische Idee sozialer Gerechtigkeit, eine Kritik und Ergänzung der Socialtheorie Herbert Spencers*, Zürich, 1896. SCHULZE-GAEVERNITZ, *Zum socialen Frieden*, II, 176-86.

the historical school. Bagehot said of the classical political economy in his *Economic Studies*, 1880, "It is a convenient series of deductions from assumed axioms which are never quite true, which in many times and countries would be utterly untrue, but which are sufficiently near to the principal conditions of the modern English world to make it useful to consider them by themselves." Stanley Jevons (*On the Future of Political Economy*, 1876) and Cliffe Leslie (*Essays, Moral and Political*, 1879) followed Bagehot in the development of the historical school. The gigantic work of Thorold Rogers on *Agriculture and Prices* had been appearing from 1866 to 1882, to be followed by *Work and Wages* in 1884. Cunningham's *Growth of English Industry and Commerce* was first issued in 1882. In 1881-2 Arnold Toynbee delivered at Oxford his lectures on the "Industrial Revolution." Since that time the inductive method has been in the ascendancy in England. Whatever be the faults of Henry George's *Progress and Poverty*, which appeared about this time, its theories were founded on a startling array of facts. Even Marx's *Capital*, the English translation of which appeared in 1883, although its deductions influenced certain socialist bodies, contributed, by its exhaustive treatment of capitalistic production, valuable material for the inductive students. This material is still used, while his theories are rejected by the thoughtful English socialist. The following declaration of Professor Ingram in the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (Article, Political Economy) would probably be accepted by all the leading English economists of the last decade: "It cannot be permanently our business to go on amending and limiting the Ricardian doctrines and asking by what special interpretations of phrases or additional qualifications they may still be admitted as having a certain value. The time for a new construction has arrived." That new construction has been taking place in the hands of the younger economists ever since.

By the legislation of 1875 trade unions were assured an uninterrupted development which has been wonderfully realized. In 1884 the last great reform act was passed, extending the franchise to more voters than had received it by the two previous acts.

IV. 1880-1896.—The great name which falls in this period is that of William Morris. A disciple of Ruskin, he developed the philosophy of his master into genuine socialism. As manufacturer of the most beautiful fabrics, designer of unsurpassed patterns, printer of the handsomest books, original and edifying lecturer, vigorous and fearless agitator, even as uncrowned poet laureate, he contributed to socialism. He is doubtless (not forgetting Marx) the greatest man who has advocated the cause of socialism. It may further be said that his has been the most elevating influence, his teachings, while idealistic, often the most profoundly practical, his life the greatest benediction enjoyed in the socialist movement. It would be hard to find a more pithy and pregnant statement of socialistic idealism than this: "First, a healthy body; second, an active mind in sympathy with the past, the present, and the future; thirdly, occupation fit for a healthy body and an active mind; and, fourthly, a beautiful world to live in."¹

Mention has already been made of the influence of the foreigners, Karl Marx and Henry George, to whom must be added Frederick Engels in this period. As their contributions to English socialism have only become effective after adaptation by Englishmen to English conditions, nothing more need be said.²

The Fabian Society, the most unique and progressive of socialist organizations, enjoys the position almost of an individual of strong personality. The members have in fact had all the

¹ References.—MORRIS, *Signs of Change*, London, 1888; *Hopes and Fears for Art*, London; *Art and Socialism*; Hammersmith's Socialist Society's Tract: *News from Nowhere*, New York; *The Dream of John Ball*, New York. VALLANCE, *The Art of William Morris* (only an edition de luxe, London, 1897). TRIGGS, O. L., articles in *Folk-Lore*. ZUEBLIN, R. F., "William Morris, a Poet's Workshop," *The Outlook*, October 31, 1896. ASHBEE, *Workshop Reconstruction and Citizenship*, Boston, 1895. HORNE, H. P., "William Morris," *Saturday Review*, Christmas, 1896.

² References.—MARX, *Capital*, translation by Engels and Aveling, 1883. ENGELS, *The Condition of the Working Classes in 1844*, Soc. Sci. Ser. *Socialism, Utopian and Scientific*, Soc. Sci. Ser. GEORGE, *Progress and Poverty*. WALLACE, A. R., *Land Nationalization*, Soc. Sci. Ser. HYNDMAN, *The Historical Basis of Socialism*. AVELING, *The Student's Marx*, Soc. Sci. Ser.

advantages and disadvantages of a "school." Their compact organization, controlled by a handful of strong leaders, has developed socialist theory as few individuals have been able to do, while at the same time the division of labor among the members and the limits of their specialties have deprived the society of some of the most important influences. The progress of thought within the society has been quite remarkable, and is well treated in G. Bernard Shaw's lecture on "The Fabian Society," delivered in 1892 (tract number 44). So marked, indeed, has been their progress that they are hardly more in harmony with the average Marxist group than with the Liberty and Property Defense League. The latest developments in Fabian thought are expressed in the manifesto presented to the International Socialist Congress in London, 1896. This is in large part reprinted in Bernard Shaw's article (*Cosmopolis*, September 1896), next to Morris' *Art and Socialism*, the most brilliant defense of socialism in English. As laid down in the manifesto —

The object of the Fabian Society is to persuade the English people to make their political constitution thoroughly democratic, and so to socialize their industries as to make the livelihood of the people entirely independent of private capitalism The Fabian Society does not suggest that the state should monopolize industry as against private enterprise or individual initiative The distinction made between state socialism and social democracy in Germany has no meaning in England. It [the Fabian society] has no distinctive opinions on the marriage question, religion, art, abstract economics, historic evolution, currency It recognizes that social democracy is not the whole of the working-class programme Each installment of social democracy will only be a measure among other measures The Fabian Society, far from holding aloof from other bodies, urges its members to lose no opportunity of joining them, and permeating them with Fabian ideas as far as possible Compromise is a necessary condition of political progress The Fabian Society has no romantic illusions as to the freedom of the proletariat from narrow (middle class) ideals The Fabian Society discards such phrases as "the abolition of the wage system," which can only mislead the public as to the aims of socialism resolutely opposes all pretensions to hamper the socialization of industry with equal wages, equal hours of labor, equal official status, or equal authority for everyone The Fabian

Society does not put socialism forward as a panacea for the ills of human society, but only for those produced by defective organization of industry and by a radically bad distribution of wealth.

In addition to the official contributions of the Fabian Society in literature and practical politics, the Fabian spirit has been abundantly manifested in independent publications of its members, some of them among the most important contributions to practical politics, economics, and sociology, and many ephemeral but important contributions to newspapers.¹

David G. Ritchie is proving the ablest of the many pupils of T. H. Green. No one has done more efficient service in the application of evolutionary principles to politics, with the result among others of extending Green's influence in the defense of state intervention as an instrument in securing personal liberty.²

Among those who have developed more scientifically than Morris, Ruskin's ideas of wealth and consumption, and applied them to economics and sociology, are Ingram, Toynbee, Geddes, Mackenzie, Hobson, and Smart. The most active and influential of these writers are John A. Hobson and William Smart. The latter has undone some of Marx's influence by popularizing the theory of value of the Austrian school. An unusual interest attaches to their economic writings because the subject they chiefly treat, consumption, lies on the threshold of sociology.

The problem to which they are contributing is to determine the influence on both producer and consumer of a transition from quantitative to qualitative consumption, that is, to enable indi-

¹ References.—*Fabian Essays*, London and Boston; *Fabian Tracts* (last No., 74), London. BEATRICE POTTER (WEBB), *The Coöperative Movement*; Soc. Sci. Ser. *Trade Unions and Coöperation*, Manchester, 1892. WEBB, S., *Socialism in England*, Soc. Sci. Ser.; *Three Years' Work on the London County Council*, London, 1895; *A London Programme*, Soc. Sci. Ser.; "Municipal Progress," *Coöper. Soc. Annual*, 1896. WEBB, S. and B., *The History of Trade Unionism*, 1895; numerous articles in the *Economic Review*, the *Economic Journal*, the *Political Science Quarterly*, etc.; WEBB, S. and COX, H., *The Eight Hours' Day*. BALL, S., "The Moral Aspects of Socialism," *Int. Jour. Ethics*, April 1896.

² References.—RITCHIE, *State Interference*, Soc. Sci. Ser.; *Darwinism and Politics*, Soc. Sci. Ser., 2d ed., 1891; *Natural Rights*, London, 1895; "Social Evolution," *Int. Jour. of Ethics*, January 1896.

viduals to satisfy a preference for durable goods instead of perishable, goods whose use is social rather than those whose consumption is selfish, and goods expressing individuality instead of fashion's products. The higher wants of life can only be satisfied by individual production. Art and music are not machine made. Machine products are exactly alike, but consumers are not. There can be little progressive consumption so long as consumers sink their individuality. As qualitative consumption increases the individuality both of consumer and producer is encouraged, a higher class of labor is employed. As such tastes increase there is a probability, almost a necessity, that the lower wants shall be satisfied by routine effort. Machinery is naturally adapted to the satisfaction of routine wants, provided it be under social control. The character of machine production is essentially collective. The maladies of machine industry are due to the fact that this collective character is inadequately recognized. But it is impossible to obtain this recognition until there is a greatly increased demand for the products of individualized labor. Qualitative consumption will stimulate the demand for a variety of products, but it must be accompanied by the desire to consume now. This is a necessity not only to avoid overproduction, but because the effort to consume now in the satisfaction of existing wants will stimulate new ones. The truest conception of consumption is to combine work and life. It is a great evil for a laborer to work too hard to enjoy consumption today, and be too idle tomorrow to consume qualitatively. The problem of the overworked capitalist and the unemployed laborer is in a sense one. The manifest implications of such theories of consumption, though not necessarily claimed by the writers, are the collective organization of routine efforts and universality of labor and leisure.¹

¹ *References.*—INGRAM, *History of Political Economy*, article in *Encyclopædia Britannica*. GEDDES, *John Ruskin, Economist*, Round Table Series, 1884; *The Claims of Labor*, 1886. MACKENZIE, *Introduction to Social Philosophy*, Glasgow, 1890. SMART, *The Theory of Value*, London, 1891; *Studies in Economics*, London, 1895. HOBSON, *The Evolution of Modern Capitalism*, New York, 1889; *The Unemployed*, London, 1896.

It must be recognized that while these contributions have been enabling the collectivist movement to gather strength, as important or even weightier influences have been at work in the world of facts. To mention but two forces; the Parish Council's Act gives power to local governing bodies to become land owners, and in some cases the power has been already exercised; the municipalization of monopolies has proceeded with great rapidity of recent years.¹

If it is asked why so little attention has been given to the critics of collectivism, the answer is not far to seek.² The work of the earlier and influential critics like Herbert Spencer has been undone, as is evidenced by the strong collectivist tendency of the last few decades. Whatever be the strength of individualism elsewhere it has no hold on the social philosophy of contemporary England, though it is still as strong as ever in some commercial and financial circles, such as manufacturers' associations and the Liberty and Property Defense League.

Many great writers are neither individualist nor collectivist, such, for example, as Marshall, Cunningham, Sidgwick, Leslie Stephen, and Charles Booth. Even John Morley's latest political addresses are "tainted" with vague demands for "Labor." The defense of individualism rests, with one exception, in the hands of writers who are their own refutation. The strongest

¹ References.—SHAW, A., *Municipal Government in Great Britain*, New York. BELL and PATON, *Glasgow: Its Municipal Administration*, Glasgow, 1896. PARKER, G. F., "Birmingham," *Century*, November 1896; WEBB, S., *Socialism in England*, Soc. Sci. Ser.; "Municipal Progress," *Coöp. Soc. Ann.*; 'Three Years' Work of the London County Council. *London (Weekly Organ of the London Reform Union)*, invaluable for students of municipal movements.

² References.—MARSHALL, *Economics*, 2d ed. CUNNINGHAM, *History of English Industry and Commerce*, Vol. II., Cambridge, 1892. SIDGWICK, *Methods of Ethics*, 5th ed., London, 1893; *Elements of Politics*, London, 1891; *Principles of Political Economy*, London, 1883; STEPHEN, L., *Science of Ethics*, London, 1882; *Social Rights and Duties*, 2 vols., London, 1896. BOSANQUET, B., *Aspects of the Social Problem*, "The Moral Aspects of Socialism," *Int. Jour. of Ethics*, July 1896. MALLOCK, W. H., *Labor and the Popular Welfare*, London, 1894; *Classes and Masses*, London, 1896. DONISTHORPE, W., *Individualism, a System of Politics*, London, 1889; *Law in a Free State*, London, 1895. HAKE and WESSLAU, *The Coming Individualism*, London, 1896. MCKECHNIE, *The State and the Individual*, Glasgow, 1896.

opponent of collectivistic devices is probably Bernard Bosanquet. Others are of the rank of the prodigal novelist, W. H. Mallock, who, wandering in the strange paths of economics, has lately taken to writing axiomatic defenses of individualism, or Geoffrey Drage, who sublimates much valuable material, gathered by scholarly effort, with a strong tincture of Toryism. The influences of privilege, reaction, and conservatism are for the moment ascendant in England, but the social philosophy is strongly collectivist.

CHARLES ZUEBLIN.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.